

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Watkinson (USPPN 2004/0122890 A1) ("Watkinson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the following elements:

- receiving a first multicast routing protocol (MRP) message **at a rendezvous point (RP) router**, wherein the first MRP message is a request to join a multicast group;
- translating the first MRP message into a second MRP message, wherein the second MRP message is a request to join the multicast group of receivers to which data is being provided by a specific source, **and the translating is performed by the rendezvous point (RP) router**.

The Office Action mailed June 27, 2007 ("OA") states that Paragraphs 0028 and 0052 of Watkinson disclose receiving and translating a first MRP message into a second MRP message **by a rendezvous point (RP) router**. Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph 0028 makes no mention whatsoever of an RP router. Paragraph 0052 mentions an RP router but does not disclose that an RP router receives and performs translation of a first MRP message into a second MRP message. Instead Paragraph 0052 discloses a "special RPF check based on...the Rendezvous Point." Paragraph 0052 goes on to

explicitly state that “this step may not be performed by the embodiment, as it is not needed.” The cited portions of the reference disclose the possibility of an RP router performing a “special RPF check.” This is not the same as an RP router receiving a first MRP message and translating the first MRP message into a second MRP message. Since the cited sections of Watkinson do not disclose all the limitations of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, is patentable over Watkinson.

Applicants have amended independent claims 11, 12, and 13 to include limitations similar to those of claim 1. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11, 12, and 13, and all claims depending therefrom, are patentable over Watkinson.


For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 13, and all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Shawn Doman
Patent Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099